

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/789,423	02/27/2004	Harald Bottner	M0659.0002	5684
38881 7590 11/29/2007 DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO LLP 1177 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS 6TH AVENUE			EXAMINER	
			SANDVIK, BENJAMIN P	
NEW YORK, NY 10036-2714		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2826	
	•			
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/29/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
	10/789,423	BOTTNER ET AL.		
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit		
	Ben P. Saṇdvik	2826		
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	I. sely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status				
1) ■ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 Section 2a) ■ This action is FINAL. 2b) ■ This 3) ■ Since this application is in condition for allower closed in accordance with the practice under Example 2.	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro			
Disposition of Claims				
 4) Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1 and 7-21 is/are with 5) Claim(s) 2-4 is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 5,6 and 22 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or 	ndrawn from consideration.			
Application Papers				
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accomplicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct and the specific production is objected to by the Examine	epted or b) objected to by the I drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119				
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 				
Attachment(s)				
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Di 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:	ate		

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 9/19/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In regard to claim 5, the applicant argues that the amendments distinguish the claim of the Tauchi reference. However, the limitation continues to be drawn to "product by process" subject matter as noted below.

Applicant's arguments, with respect to claim 2 have been fully considered and are persuasive. The rejection of claims 2-4 has been withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 5, 6, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tauchi (U.S. Patent #5966939), in view of Hayes et al (U.S. Patent #6077380).

With respect to **claim 5**, Tauchi teaches a soldered joint (Fig. 1, 22) that joins at least two components, at least one component comprising at least two substrates (Fig. 1, 11 and 12) joined together by said solder, and each substrate has a thermo electric material (Fig. 1, 25 and 26) arranged thereon; but does not teach a solder comprising a eutectic mixture of gold and bismuth. Hayes teaches a component having at least one soldering layer for joining to at least one further

Application/Control Number: 10/789,423

Art Unit: 2826

component (Fig. 9a, the layer formed by balls 108), which component includes at least one soldering layer made from a solder comprising a eutectic mixture of gold and bismuth (Col 6 Ln 64 to Col 7 Ln 6). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a solder as taught by Hayes in the structure of Tauchi in order to optimize the fabrication process of the device.

Furthermore, with respect to the limitation of claim 5 "wherein an orientation of a layer arrangement of the thermoelectric material and the solder of each of the at least two substrates is alternatingly spaced between the thermoelectric material of the other of the at least two substrates"; this amended limitation is directed to a process of fabricating two substrates each having thermoelectric material arranged thereon and subsequently joining the substrates as in Figs. 6A and 6B of the instant applicant. Note that a "product by process" claim is directed to the product per se, no matter how actually made, In re Hirao, 190 USPQ 15 at 17 (footnote 3). See also In re Brown, 173 USPQ 685; In re Luck, 177 USPQ 523; In re Wertheim, 191 USPQ 90 (209 USPQ 554 does not deal with this issue); In re Fitzgerald, 205 USPQ 594, 596 (CCPA); In re Marosi et al., 218 USPQ 289 (CAFC); and most recently, In re Thorpe et al., 227 USPQ 964 (CAFC, 1985) all of which make it clear that it is the final product per se which must be determined in a "product by process" claim, and not the patentability of the process, and that, as here, an old or obvious product produced by a new method is not patentable as a product, whether claimed in

"product by process" claims or not. Note that Applicant has burden of proof in such cases as the above case law makes clear. As to the grounds of rejection under section 103, see MPEP § 2113

With respect to **claim 6**, Tauchi teaches that the thermoelectric material is arranged in the form of a Peltier cooler.

With respect to **claim 22**, Tauchi teaches that the at least one component has a thermal functionality (Col 3 Ln 43-46).

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 2-4 are allowed.

The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance: the best prior art of record does not disclose device comprising a soldered joint having a gold/bismuth eutectic, a bismuth layer, and a gold layer.

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Application/Control Number: 10/789,423 Page 5

Art Unit: 2826

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ben P. Sandvik whose telephone number is (571) 272-8446. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sue Purvis can be reached on 571-272-1236. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/789,423 Page 6

Art Unit: 2826

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

bps

EVAN PERT
PRIMARY EXAMINER